

REMARKS

The Applicant has reviewed the Final Official Action mailed by the Office on 12 August 2005 (hereinafter, the "Final Action"), and submits this paper as a fully-responsive reply thereto.

Claims 1-6, 23-28, and 36-41 are pending in this application. As stated in Paragraph 4 of the Action, claims 1-6, 23-28, and 36-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a document entitled "Ten Minute Guide to WordPerfect 5.1 for Windows", published in 1992 (hereinafter, "Walkowski." Walkowski in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,450 to Pensak, et al. (hereinafter, "Pensak"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Turning first to independent claim 1, the Applicant reproduces it here for convenience, with emphasis added to certain features to further ease discussion:

"1. (Previously Presented) In an extensible electronic document editor, a selection services component comprising a selection services interface that provides one or more methods to enable *an editor extension to override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor and provide a customized model for the selection function*, and to clear, add or remove a segment from a selection object using the customized model for the selection function."

The Applicant agrees with the assessment at the bottom of page 2 of the Action that Walkowski fails to specifically disclose an override selection function provided to a document editor to provide a customized model for the selection function. Accordingly, the Action cited column 4, lines 11-49 for this teaching.

1 However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Pensak fails to provide the
2 teaching or suggestion missing from Walkowski that is necessary to support a
3 § 103 rejection of claim 1.

4
5 For convenience, the Applicant reproduces the cited portion of Pensak here:

6 The Administrator Utility

10 The Administrator Utility 226 is a network client appli-
7 cation used by the human Coordinator 240 and other users
8 to control access to documents selected for encryption by
9 defining policies associated with a document. The Admin-
15 istrator Utility 228 is a software program residing on the
10 user's computer 222, 224. The Coordinator 240 or authoring
11 user 208 uses the Administrator Utility 228 to define policies
12 related to a particular user. For example, the Coordinator
20 240 can use the Administrator Utility 228 to control the
13 functions available to a particular authoring user 208, which
14 might depend on the fees paid by the authoring user 208, or
15 the Coordinator 240 can control the amount of access an
16 authoring user 208 can allow to viewing users 216. Other
17 policies that an individual can define using the Administrator
25 Utility 228 are site policies, group policies, and default
14 policies.

15 The Administrator Utility 228 allows the Coordinator 240
16 or authoring or viewing user 208, 216 to determine what
17 documents have been registered by a particular user by
20 accessing the registered user database 236. The Administra-
18 tor Utility 228 also allows an authoring user to permanently
19 disable the viewing of documents by deleting the associated
21 decryption key from the server. The Administrator Utility
22 228 also allows an authoring user 208 to initially define the
35 policies related to his documents and to change the policies
23 after the documents have initially been registered.

19 The Administrator Utility 228 allows a normal authoring
20 user 208 to create, edit, and delete time windows, network
21 specifications and policy templates; view the list of regis-
40 tered documents; and view and edit the policies of docu-
22 ments that are registered. The Administrator Utility 228
23 allows the Coordinator 240 to create, edit, and delete users
24 and user policies; create, edit, and delete groups of users and
45 group policies; create, edit, and delete document groups and
25 document group policies; define and modify the Site and
Default policies; create, edit, and delete document override
policies; and view the activity log and set up notification
policies

The Application Interface

1 Pensak pertains generally to information security architecture for
2 encrypting documents for remote access while maintaining access control. As
3 such, Pensak provides little, if any, teaching specifically pertaining to an
4 extensible electronic document editor, which is the subject matter that is recited in
5 claim 1. More particularly, the above excerpt from Pensak neither teaches nor
6 suggests "... an editor extension to override a selection function provided by the
7 electronic document editor and provide a customized model for the selection
8 function...", as recited above in the Applicant's claim 1.
9

10 While column 4, line 20 of Pensak may mention controlling which
11 functions are available to a particular authoring user 208, this falls well short of
12 the teaching or suggestion necessary to support a § 103 rejection of claim 1.
13 Pensak appears to describe making particular functions either available or
14 unavailable to particular users. However, Pensak does not make clear whether
15 these available or unavailable functions are related specifically to an electronic
16 document editor. Furthermore, making a given feature unavailable to a given
17 particular authoring user 208 does not teach or suggest "overrid[ing] a selection
18 function provided by the electronic document editor and provid[ing] a customized
19 model for the selection function", as recited in claim 1.
20
21

22 Turning to other portions of Pensak, column 4, lines 57-61 thereof
23 describes adding function buttons such as register, create policies, tag, encrypt,
24 view, and decrypt. However, adding new functions neither teaches nor suggests
25

1 overriding an existing function and providing a customized model for that existing
2 function, as recited in claim 1.

3 Additionally, column 5, lines 1-3 of Pensak describes blocking certain
4 functions at the user's computer 224 that would otherwise be available in Adobe
5 Acrobat Exchange. However, blocking functions neither teaches nor suggests
6 overriding an existing function and providing a customized model for that existing
7 function, as recited in claim 1. Making a function unavailable to a user hardly
8 constitutes providing a customized function to the user.
9

10
11 On at least the foregoing bases, the Applicant submits that Pensak fails to
12 supply the teaching or suggestion missing from Walkowski necessary to support a
13 § 103 rejection of claim 1. Therefore, Walkowski and Pensak do not support a
14 § 103 rejection of claim 1. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and
15 withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom.
16

17 Turning to **independent claims 23 and 36**, these claims recite features
18 similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Thus, the Applicant's
19 comments directed above to claim 1 regarding Walkowski and Pensak apply
20 equally to claims 23 and 36, as well as all claims depending therefrom. On at least
21 the foregoing bases, the Applicant submits that Walkowski and Pensak do not
22 support a § 103 rejection of claims 23 and 36, and the Applicant requests
23 reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 23 and 36, and all
24 claims depending therefrom.
25

Conclusion

In light of the above revisions and comments, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 1-6, 23-28, and 36-41. If discussion of this case would advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to arrange a telephone interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 11 OCT 05

By: 

Rocco L. Adornato
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256 x257